

AN

(25) 32

# ANSWER

To the most materiall parts of

Dr. HAMOND'S

Booke of *Schisme*: Or a defence of the Church

OF

ENGLAND,

Against exceptions of the *Romanists*:

Written in A Letter from a Catho-

lique Gent. to his friend in

ENGLAND.



---

LONDON,  
Printed Anno Dom. 1654.

99 (25)





A N

## A N S W E R

To the most materiall parts of  
Doctor *Hamonds* Book of *Schisme*,

1636.

SIR,



Ou have been pleased to send me  
Doctor *Hamonds* Book of *Schisme*,  
or a defence of the Church of  
*England*, against the exceptions  
of the Romanists, as also your  
letters, wherein you lay Commands on me to  
read it, and thereupon to give you my opini-  
on: truly Sir, both the one and the other could  
never have come to me in better season, for  
having heard from som of my friends in *Eng'land*  
a good while since of another book, written by  
one Doctor *Ferne* to the same purpose, as also  
one lately come out of the Bishop of *Deries*,  
and of this which you have sent me, I was

A 2

wondering

wondering what those who call themselves of the Church of *England* could say to defend them from Schisme, but now your favour in letting me see this of Doctor *Hammonds*, I am freed from my bondage, and satisfied in supposition that the most can adde little to what hath been upon that subject of Schisme said by him, whom you stile wise and learned, and well may he be so, but here he hath failed, as all men must that take in hand to defend bad lawes, which I think to make appeare to you or any indifferent Judge, and which I will doe rather upon some observations of severall passages in his booke then consideration of the whole, which I will leave for some other who hath more leasure, in the meane time I must say with the Poet, speaking of some Lawyers in his time, *Fures, sit Pedio, Pedius quid? Crimina raris librat in Antihetis*: The Roman Catholique sayes to Doctor *Hamond*, You are an Heretick, you are a Schismatick, & Doctor *Hamond* replies good English, some Criticismes, much greefe, with many citations out of antiquity indifferent to both parts of the question: but to draw neere your satisfaction: his first Chap. is for the body of it common to both parts, yet I cannot omit one strange peece of logick at the end of it, where he concludeth, that the occasion or motive of Schisme is not to be considered, but only the tact of Schisme,

of



of which position I can see no connection to any premises going before, and it selfe is a pure contradiction, for not a division but a causelesse division is a Schisme and how a division can be shewed to be unreasonable, and causelesse without examining the occasions, and motives, I do not understand, nor (with his favour) as I think he himselfe.

Much of the second Chap. is likewise common to both, only he slightly passeth over the distinction of Heresie and Schisme, as if he would not have it understood that all Heresie is Schisme, though some Schisme be no Heresie, againe treating of Excommunication he easily slideth over this part, that wilfull continuance in a just Excommunication maketh Schisme, what he calls Mr. *Knolls* Concession, I take to be the publique profession of the Roman, or Catholique Church, and that nature it selfe teacheth all rationall men, that any Congregation that can lye, and knoweth not whether it doth lye or no, in any proposition: cannot have power to bind any particular to beleieve what she sayeth, neither can any man of understanding have an obligation to beleieve what shee teacheth *farther then agrees with the rules of his owne reason*: Out of which it followeth, that the Roman Churches binding of men to a profession of faith (which the Protestants and other Hereticall multitudes have likewise usurped) if she be infallible, is evidently gentle, charitable,

ritable, right, and necessary, as contrariwise  
 in any other Church or Congregation, which  
 pretends not to infallibility, the same is  
 unjust, tyrannicall, and a selfe-condemnation  
 to the binders: so that the state of the  
 question will be this, Whether the Catho-  
 lique or Roman Church, be infallible or no, for  
 shee pretendeth not to bynd any man to te-  
 nets or beleefs upon any other ground or title.  
 By this you may perceive much of his dis-  
 course—to be not only superfluous and *un-*  
*necessary*, but contrary to himselfe, for he la-  
 boureth to perswade that the Protestant may  
 be certaine of some truth, against which the  
 Roman Catholique Church bindeth to profes-  
 sion of error, which is as much to say as he who  
 pretendeth to have no infallible rule, by which  
 to govern his Doctrine shall be supposed to be  
 fallible, and he that pretendeth to have an in-  
 fallible rule shall be supposed to be fallible: at  
 most because fallible objections are brought a-  
 gainst him, now then consider what a meeke  
 and humble Son of the Church ought to do,  
 when of the one side is the authority of Anti-  
 quity, and possession (such antiquity and  
 possession without dispute or contradictions from  
 the adversarie, as no King can shew for his Crowne,  
 and much lesse any other person or persons for any o-  
 ther thing) the perswasion of infallibility; all  
 the pledges that Christ hath left to his Church  
 for motives of Union: on the other side *uncer-*  
*taine* reasons of a few men pretending to learning  
 every

every day contradicted by incomparable numbers of men wise and learned, and those few men confessing those reasons, and themselves uncertaine, fallible, and subject to error, certainly without a bias of interest, or prejudice, it is impossible for him to leave the Church if he be in it, or not returne if he be out of it: for if infallibility be the ground of the Churches power to command beleefe, as she pretends no other, no time, no seperation within memory of History, can justifie a continuance out of the Church: You may please to consider then, how solid this Doctors discourse is, who telleth us, for his great evidence that he (saith he) who do not acknowledge the Church of Rome to be infallible, may be allowed to make certaine suppositions (that follow there) The question is whether a Protestant be a Schismaticque, because a Protestant; and he will prove he is not a Scismaticque, because he goeth consequently to Protestant, that is Schismaticall grounds: I pray you reflect, that not to acknowledge the Church to be infallible is that for which we charge the Doctor with Schisme, and Hæresie in *Capite*, and more then for all the rest he holds distinct from us, for this principle taketh away all beleefe, and a'l ground of beleefe, and turneth it into uncertainty and Weather-cock opinion, putteth us iuto the condition to be *circumferri omni vento Doctrinæ*, submitteh us to Atheism and all sort of miscre-  
ancie

ancie, Let him not then overleape the question, but either prove this is not sufficient to make him a Schismatick (i) and an heritique too, let him acknowledge he is both.

In his third Chap. what is cheefely to be noted to our purpose, is, that his division is insufficient, for he maketh Schisme to be only against Monarchicall power or against fraternall charity, which is very much besides the principles of those Protestants who pretend so much to the authority of Councells, me thinks he should have remembred there might be Schisme against Consiliatory, authority, whether this be called so when the Councel actually sitteth, or in the unanimity of beleefe in the disperſion of the Churches, so that the Doctor (supposing he concluded against the Pope) hath not concluded himself no Schismatick, being separated from the Catholique world; in this Chap. he telleth us many things, some true, some not so, but all either Common to us both, or not appertaining to the controversie, untill he concludes that certainly the Roman Patriarchie did not extend it selfe to all stately and this he does out of a word in *Rufinus*, which he supposeth to be taken in a speciall propriety of Law, whereas indeed that Authors knowledge in Grammar was not such as should necessarily exact any such beleefe, especially learned men saying the contrary.

Then

Than he telleth you that the Office of Primats *S. & 22.*  
 and Patriarchs was the same, only authorizing  
 that affirmation from an Epistle of Anacletus, *He urgeth*  
 the which as soon as occasion serveth, he will tell *Gratian too.*  
 you is of no Authority, but fictitious, then he saith  
 there was no power over the Patriarchs, his proof  
 is because the Emperor *used his secular Authority*  
*in gathering of Councils*, concluding that because  
 the Pope did not gather general Councils, there-  
 fore he had no Authority over the Universal  
 Church, which how unconsequent that is, I leave  
 to your judgment, but I must not forget here  
 what I omitted to insert before, that in his divisi-  
 on of schism he omitteth the principal, if not in-  
 deed, & in the use of the word by the Antients, the  
 only schism which is when one breaketh from  
 the whole Church of God, for though a breach  
 made from the immediate superiour, or a parti-  
 cular Church, may in some sort, and in our or-  
 dinary manner of speaking be called a schism, yet  
 that by which one breaketh away from the com-  
 munion of the whole Church, is properly, and in  
 a higher sence called schism, and is that out of  
 which the present question proceedeth, whereas  
 other divisions, as long as both parts remain in  
 communion with the universal Church, are not  
 properly schisms, but with a diminutive particle,  
 so that in this division he left out that part which  
 appertained to the Question.

In the fourth Chapter he pretendeth to ex-  
 mine whether by Christ his donation Saint Pe-

ter had a primacy over the Church, where not to reflect upon his curious division, I cannot omit that he remembers not what matters he handles, when he thinketh the Catholick ought to prove, that his Church, or Pope hath an Universal Primacie, for it being granted that in England the Pope was in quiet possession of such a Primacie, the proof that it was just, belongeth not to us more then to any K. who received his Kingdom from his Ancestors, a time out of mind, to prove his pretension to the Crown just: for quiet possession of it self is a proof, until the contrary be convinced: as who should Rebel against such a King were a Rebel, until he shewed sufficient cause for quitting obedience; with this difference, that obedience to a King may by prescription or bargain be made unnecessary, but if Christ hath commanded obedience to his Church, no length of years, nor change of humane affairs can ever quit us from this duty of obedience, so that the charge of proving the Pope to have no such Authority from Christ, lyeth upon the Protestants now as freshly, as the first day of the breach, and wil do so until the very last, as for his proofs which he calls evidences, he telleth us first that Saint Peter was the Apostle of the Circumcision *exclusive-ly* to the Uncircumcision, or Gentiles to prove this, he saith the Apostles distributed their great Universal Province into several *καίρις ἀποστολῆς* that is, by his interpretation, lesser Provinces, and citeth *Act. 1. v. 25.* where Saint Peter with the other

*Sid. 5.*

other Apostles prayeth God to shew which of the two proposed, he was pleased to have promoted to the dignity of being an Apostle, this they call *ἐκλογὴ ἀποστόλων* and this rigorous interpreter saith, it signifies the special Province *Saint Matthias* was to have, though the Scripture it self expresseth the contrary, saying the effect was that afterward, he was counted amongst the Apostles, could any man not blinded with error make so wretched an interpretation? but he goes on presently adding that *Saint Peter* in the same place calleth these particular provinces *τοὺς ἰσραήλ* and will you know what this *τοὺς ἰσραήλ*, or proper place is, read the Text, and you shall find that *Saint Peter* speaketh of *Judas* his going to Hell to receive his eternal damnation: Me thinks you should wonder I can go on without astonishment at such blasphemous explications, for sure it can be no less, so to abuse the Word of God, and after this what do you expect? His position is as directly against Scripture, as if he had done it on purpose, the Scripture telling us how by a special Vision *Saint Peter* was commanded to preach to *Cornelius* a Gentile, first of all the Apostles, and himself in the Councel of Jerusalem protesting the same, and yet this Doctor can teach he was made Apostle to the Jews; exclusively to the Gentiles, though all story say the contrary; Again, if he were made the Apostle of the Jews exclusively to the Gentiles, by the same reason *St. Paul* was made Apostle of the Gentiles ex-



S<sup>c</sup>d: 7.

clusively to the fence, for the words are like, and yet the Scripture teacheth us that where ever he came, he preached first to the fence; is not this to make Scripture ridiculous? but he goes on telling us that the Gentiles exclusively to the Circumcision were the lot of St. Paul by Saint Peters own confession, *his words are for the uncircumcision, or Gentiles they were not Saint Peters province, but peculiarly Saint Pauls, &c.* but look on the place, and you shall find no word of exclusion as the word peculiarly is, and wheron lyeth the whole question, so that the Doctors Evidence is his own word against the main torrent of Scripture on either side. Again, see how he wrongs St. Peter, and his Jewish profelites, where he saies he withdrew from all communion with the Gentile Christians. Whereas the Text expresseth no more, then that he withdrew from eating with them, that is, keeping the Gentile diet: upon this wisely laid ground, he would perswade us followed the division of the Bishoppricks both in *Antioch*, and *Rome*, but bringing not one word of antiquity proving this to have been the cause, yet is he so certain of it, that he will find a collonie of Jewseven in *England*, for fear St. Peter should have touched a Gentile, and yet he cites Saint *Prosper*, that both Saint Peter, and St. Paul founded the Church of Gentiles in *Rome*.

S<sup>c</sup>d: 18.S<sup>c</sup>d: 20.

A second Evidence he bringeth from the donation of the Keyes, which he sayeth were given equally to the Apostles, *Matt: 28.* yet confesseth the



the Keyes were especially promised to Saint *Peter*, *Matt: 16.* but performed only in common, *Matt: the 28.* which though they may be both true, yet is absurdly said, for who acknowledgeth a special promise, should have found out a special performance which is done, *Job: 21.* Again, *Señ: 21.* he would perswade the World that the Catholick Church holdeth, none had the Keyes but Saint *Peter*, calling it a peculiarity, and inclosure of Saint *Peter*, as if the other Apostles had them not, which is calumnie, I cannot pass without noting another old interpretation of Scripture, in his 20 *Señ: out of Matthew the 19.* speaking of the 12 Thrones at the day of Judgment, he explicates to rule, or preside in the Church, his quibbling about the Word is so light a thing, as it is not worth consideration, the sence being plain that upon *Peter* the Church was built specially, though not with exclusion of others.

In the fifth Chapter, first he lightly passeth over *Señ. 1.* ver the two most considerable Texts of Scripture fit to be alledged for Saint *Peters* supremacy, viz. *Feed my Sheep*, and thou art *Peter*: because they have no appearance, and have been often answered, Why no appearance? because he and his Fellows say so, and is if being as often repeated, was not as likely to shew the answer was naught, as the answering to impeach the Objector: but who understands the principles of Catholick Faith, knows that as well for other points of our Faith, as for this of Saint *Peters* supremacy, we relie  
not

S<sup>e</sup>d: 3.

not only upon such places of Scripture ; next he urgeth that if the succession to Saint *Peter* were the base of the Popes supremacie, *Antioch* should be the chief See, because *St: Peter* sat there, where- in to omit his first and second question, whereof the first is untrue, I answer to the third Negative- ly, that the constituting a Church, and Bishop at *Antioch* before at *Rome*, did confer no priviledg extraordinary on that Church, and the reason is clearly deduced out of his second Quære, because it was before *Rome*, for he could not give any such Authority, but by divesting himself, since there cannot be two heads to one body, therefore this Authority and priviledg of Saint *Peter* can rest, & be no where but where he dyed.

S<sup>e</sup>d: 4.

Then he tels you that the dignity, or precedence of the Bishop of *Rome* is surely much more fitly deduced by the Council of *Calcedon* from this, that *Rome* was then the Imperial City, or ordinary Residence of the Emperor: a very wise Judgment, that the quality upon which the unity, that is, the safety of the Church Universal relies, should be planted upon a bottom fallible, and subject to fail, but the resolution was so shameful that the very Patriarch was ashamed, & imputed it to his ambitious Clergy, who how tumultuary, and untuly they were, is to be seen in the Acts of the Council.

S<sup>e</sup>d: 5.

Seventhly, he cavilleth at the priviledg of Supreme Magistracy, calling it a method of security beyond all amulets: then he tels us of *Antiochs* being

being equal to *Rome*, and that Constantinople desired but the same priviledges against the very nature of the story, for Constantinople being then a Patriarchy, if that made it equal to *Rome* as this Doctor saith, what did it pretend *non est* for? seeing the Dr. assumes before that all Patriarchs were equal, neither *Rome* it self, and less Antioch had cause to complain.

As for the Canon of *Ephesus*, touching the *Sec. 6.* Arch-Bishop of *Cyprus*, it plainly sheweth that the Metropolitans were subordinate to the Patriarchs, seeing this case of *Cyprus* was a peculiar excepted case, the reason given doth shew that the superiority of Patriarchs was by custom received from their Ancestors, contrary to that which the Dr. before affirmed, however it is still nothing to the purpose, because the Authority which we say belongs to the Pope is neither Patriarchall nor derived from any institution, or custom of the Church, but from the institution of Christ.

Then he goes on with two examples, in which *Sec. 7.* he would perswade us that *Justiniana prima*, and *Carthage* were made exempt Cities by the Emperor, and seeth not that his own instance giveth the answer, for as in the temporal donation, he doth not exempt them from his own subjection, so neither from the Popes, in spiritual, nay nor as much as giveth them the stile of Patriarchs; though the Bishop of *Constantinople* in his own City ordinarily had it.

In his 6. Chapter he examineth another title *Sec. 1.*  
peculi-

S. A: 1.

peculiar to *England*. viz: that our Nation was converted by mission from *Rome*, and this is totally beside the question, for no man is so stupid as to pretend Saint *Peter*, or the Church of *Rome*, to have power over the Universal Church, because his successors converted *England*: But some pretend a special title of gratitude; the violation of which aggravateth the sin of schismatizing from the Church of *Rome* in our Nation, yet no man as far as I can understand thinks this latter Obligation of so high a nature, as that for no occasion or never so great cause, it may not be dispensed with, but only prels it, then when the benefit is slighted, or by colourable arguments to the contrary unworthily avoided, and yet this Doctor quite mistaking the question frameth an Argument, as full of words as empty of matter, affirming there cannot be two successive titles to possession of the same thing, telling us, that he who claimeth a Reward as of his own labour, and travel, must disclaim a donation, &c. if any passed before, and that if a King have right by descent, he cannot claim any thing by conquest, by which you may see his understanding the Law is not much more *then his understanding of our principles*, but to come to some matter.

S. A: 4.

His first Argument is that this Island was converted before Saint *Augustines* time, surely he means by the name of Isleland, the Land and Mountains, and Trees, for it he speak of the Men what hath the conversion of the former Islanders

to do with the subjection, and duty which the Saxons owe.

His next Argument demandeth whether al that *S. A. 8.* Saint *Paul* converted, were obliged to be under him, truly if it were to purpose I beleeeve there might be proof that Saint *Paul* expected it, but he doth not remember that he tould us Saint *Paul* was Bishop of *Rome*, and so it cometh to the same question, but indeed he quite misseeth the matter, for no body stateth this for the Popes title, but aggravation of the scism.

3ly: He said it was in the Emperors power to *S. A. 9.* constitute Patriarchs: whether that be so or not, it will not be much to our purpose to dispute here, only this I say, that he seems neither to understand the question, nor proves what he would, he understandeth not the question, which hath no dependencie on the nature of Patriarchs, or rearms of gratitude, but on the donation of Christ, he proves not what he would, for he produceth only the act of an Emperor accounted tyrannical towards the Church, without proof, or discussion whether it was wel or ill done, which was requisite to make good his proof, neither doth he say whether the thing were done or no by the consent of Bishops, especially since the Pope was an actor in the business, he addeth an Apocriphal Decree of *Valentinian* the third, for giving of priviledges purely Ecclesiastical to the Bp: of *Havenna*, which out of his liberality he makes a Patriarch, but on the whole matter this is to

be observed, that generally the Bishops consents were pre-demanded, or pre-ordered, as in the counsell of *Calcedon*, can 17. it is ordered that the Church should translate their Bishopricks according to the Emperors changing of his City, and when the Emperors did it, it is said they did it according to the power given them, to wit, by the Church, so that a few examples to the contrary produced in the Reigns of headstrong, and tyrannical Princes, *as the most of these were noted to be, under whom they are urged*, and as they did: The Conqueror was prov'd nothing, and if they did, yet cannot they be taken as testimonies, when these matters of fact are only so attributed to Princes, as no way to exclude the Church: but whatsoever it was, it doth not at all appertain to the question, since the Popes authority *in the sense he calls him Pope*, is not properly patriarchal, nor hath any dependencie upon, or from, change of places *made by the command of Princes*.

In his 7th. Chap. he intends a justification of  
 Begun in H. 8. the breach, whereof as he doth not teach the infamous occasion, and how to his dying day the same King desired to be reconciled, as also that it was but the coming two days short of a Post to *Rome*, which hindered that the reconciliation was not actually made, as may be seen in my Lo: of Charberies book, fol. 368: and that the moderate Protestants curse the day wherein it was made, so the very naming of H: 8th. is enough to confute all his discourse, one of the darlings

darlings of his Daughter having given him such a character as hath stamped him for *Englands Nero* to future posterity, and as it was said of *Nero* in respect of Christian Religion: so might it be of him respecting the unity of the Church, viz: it must be a great good, which he began to persecute and abolish: and as for the Acts passed in the Universities Convocation or Parliament, let the blood shed by that Tyrant bear witness what voluntary and free Acts they were, especially those two upon his *Seneca* and *Burby*, Bishop *Fisher*, and the Chancellor *More*, that he might want nothing of being throughly parallel'd to *Nero*.

Sir Walter  
Raleigh in  
Preface to Hi-  
story of the  
World.

But me thinks the Doctor differs not much in this, seeming tacitly to grant the Bishops were forced, awed by that noted sword in a slender threed, the *præmunire*, which did hang over their heads, though in the conclusion of that *Señ*: he saies we ought to judge charitably, viz. that they did not judge for fear nor temporal Interests: yet after waves the advantage of that charitable judgment, & saith, That if what was determined were falsly determined by the King and Bishops, then the voluntary and free doing it will not justify, and if it were not, then was there truth in it antecedent to, and abstracted from the determination, and it was their duty so to determine, and conclude that they were unwilling: laying the whole weight of the Argument upon this, that the pretentions for the Popes Supre-

macie in *England* must be founded either as Successor to *St. Peter* in the Universal Pastorship of the Church, so including *England* as a Member thereof, or upon paternal right respecting *St. Augustines* conversion, or upon concession from some of our Kings, &c. To which I answer, that we relye on the first as the foundation and corner stone of the whole building. On the 2d. as an action worthy the Successor of *St. Peter*, which requires a gratefull consideration from us. And on the 3d. not as a concession, but as a just acknowledgment of what was necessarie to the good of Christian Religion, taught our Kings by those who taught them Christian Religion; of which belief, I mean that the Pope as successor to *St. Peter* is head and governor of the universal Church, we have been in possession ever since the conversion of our English Ancestors, then *Saxons*, to the Christian Religion made by *Austin* the Monk sent hither by Pope *Gregory* for that purpose: untill that good King *Henry* the 8th. out of scrupulositie of conscience (no doubt) was pleased to cut the guordian knot of those bonds within which all his Ancestors li-mitted themselves; neither shal at that the Doct. and his fellows have said, or can say, justifie themselves so, but that such a possession as I here speak of will convince them of schism, though all those replyes which by ours have been 40 times made to everie one of those Arguments the Doct. uses shold bear but equal weight in the scale,



scale, which we think hoyle it up into the air, for the arguments must be demonstrative & clear to men of common sence, that must overthrow such a possession; and therefore it is that the Puritans who are much less friends to the Church of *Rome* then to the Church of *England* were all disputing out of Antiquity, and confess, that the Church of *Rome* hath born a sway with-  
Napier on the Revelation.  
 out any debatable contradiction over the Christian world 1200 years, a time that no King in the world can pretend to by succession from his Ancestors for possession of his Crown, and yet I beleieve the Doctor would conclude those Subjects guilty of Rebellion, which should go about to deprive such a King of his Crown, though he could not shew writings evidently concluding for him 12, 14, 15, or 1600 year ago, how much more if he could shew them demonstrating his right in the interpretation of as wise and learned men as the world hath, and 20 times the numbers of their adversaries: Queen *Scd: 11.*  
*Maries* titular retaining of the Supremacie untill she could dispose the disordered hearts of her subjects to get it peaceably revoked, is no authority for the Doctor, she never pretending it to be lawfully done, but that she could not do otherwise, and by the refusing of a Legat which in all Catholick times and Countreys hath been practised and thought lawfull, King *Edward* a  
Scd: 12.  
 childe of nine years old fell into the hands of wicked ambitious Traitors, who knowing the  
 King-

Sect: 15.

Kingdom affected for Religions sake to Queen *Mary*, to cut off her succession and introduce their own, thought fit to strengthen their faction, which besides what they might hope from abroad, consisted of many *Lutherans* and *Calvinists* at home; those two Sects having by opportunity of that rupture in *H:* the 8th. time, spread and nestled themselves in many parts of *England*, Queen *Elizabeth* being by Act of Parliament recorded a bastard, and so pronounced by two Popes, and therefore mistrusting all her Catholick Subjects who she feared did adhere to the Queen of *Scots* title, in which she was then likely to be supported by the King of *France* her Husband, was by the advise of men partly infected with *Calvinisme* or *Lutheranisme*, partly ambitious of making their fortunes cast upon that desperate Councell of changing Religion, desperate, I say, for see amongst what a number of Rocks she was, in consequence of that Councel forced to sail, witness her adhearing to the Rebels of all her neighbour Kings, so provoking them thereby as if the *French* King had not been taken out of this world, and winde and weather fought against the *Spanish* Armado, in all likelihood she had been ruined, especially her Catholick Subjects being so provoked as they were by most cruel and bloodie Laws; but this by the by: though from hence the Reader may judge of reason of changing Religion in her time, and what a solid foundation the Church of *England* hath

bath, how far Mr. *Mason* can justify the ordination of Queen *Elizabeths* Bishops, I will not *Scilicet* 16. now examine; but certain it is that the Record, (if there be such a one) hath a great prejudice of being forged, since it lay some fifty yeers unknown amongst the Clamors against the flagrant fact, and no permission given to Catholics to examine the ingenuitie of it, but howsoever it is nothing to our purpose, for whatsoever materiall mission they had by an externall consecration, those Bishops who are said to have consecrated them are not as much as pretended to have given them order to preach the Doctrine, or exercise the Religion they after did, which is the true meaning and effect of mission. I cannot end without noting in his 20 *Paras*: the foundation upon which he himself saies his whole desires relyes: which is that because the refection from the Romane Church was done by those by whom, and to whom onely the power of right belonged legally, *viz*: the King and Bishops of this Nation, therefore it is no schism, that is, whatsoever the reason of dividing hath been even to turn *Turks*, or for violating never so fundamental points of Religion, yet it had not been schism.

In his 8th. Chapter as far as I understand, he divideth schism into formal, that is, breach of Unitie, and material, that is, breach of Doctrine or Customs, in which the Church was united: the former he brancheth into subordination to the

S. D: 4.

S. D: 5.

the Pope, of which enough hath been said; and breach of the way provided by Christ for maintaining the unity of Faith, the which he puts in many subordinations without any effect. For let us as he, if inferior Clergie men, dissent from their own Bishops, but not from their Metropolitans in matter of Faith is it schism? he will answer, No: if a Metropolitan dissent from his Primate, but agree with the rest of the Patriarchs, is it schism? I think he must say, No: if a Patriarch dissent from the first, but agree with the rest, is it schism? No: if a Nation, or a Bishop dissent from the rest of the generall Councell, is it schism? still I beleieve he will answer, No: where then is schism provided against? or where truly is there any subordination in Faith? if none of these are subject, and bound to their superiors or Universals in matters of Faith. But, saith the Doctor, the Apostles resolved upon some few heads of speciall force and efficacie to the planting of Christian life, through the world, and preaching, and depositing them in every Church of their plantation.

Truly I do not know what a Catholick professeth more, so that by the word few he meaneth enough to form a Religion, and Christian life, and will shew us a Church which hath not betrayed the trust deposited; for if there be none, what availeth this depositing? if there be any, clear it is that it preserved it by tradition, if there

there be a question whether it hath or no ; again, I demand to what purpose was the depositing, so that if the Doctor would speak aloud, I doubt he would be subject to as much jealousy, as he saith *Grotius* was, I cannot but admire indeed the great temper he professeth men of his Religion have, in chusing of Doctrines, to wit, *Sect: 7.* their submission to the three first Ages, and the sourse first Councils, but I confesse it is a humility, *I understand not*, first to profess, they know not whether their teachers say true, or no, (that is, that they are fallible) and then to hold under pain of damnation what they say. Another peece of their Humility is in submitting to Ages, where very few Wicnesses can be found, in regard of the rarity of the Authors, and the little occasion they had to speak of present controversies. A third note of Humility is, that whereas the fourth Council was held about the midst of the fifth Age, these lovers of truth will stand to it, but not to the fourth Age precedent, or that very Age in which it was held, so humble they are to submit to any Authority that toucheth not the questions in present controversie, but where do they find Christs Church should be Judg in three Ages, and fail in the fourth, or that the Councils in the fifth Age should be sound, but not the Fathers.

In his 9th. Chapter he pretendeth the Roman Catholick Church, is cause of his division, because they desire communion, *and cannot be admitted, but under the beleef, and practise of things contrary to their consciences,* of which two propositions, if the second be not proved the first is vain, and is as if a subject should plead he were unjustly out-lawed, because he doth not desire it, now to prove the latter, he assumeth that the Protestant is ready to contest his Negatives, by grounds that

all good Christians ought to be concluded by, what he means by that, I know not, for that they will convince their Negatives by any ground, a good Christian ought to be concluded by, I see nothing less.

What then will they contest it by? all grounds a good *Orthodox* Christian ought to be concluded by. If they answer in the Affirmative, we shall ask them whether *Siquis Ecclesiam non audierit*, be one of their grounds, and if they say no, we shall clearly disprove their major, but then their defence is, if any ground, or *Rule* of it self firm, and good, speaketh nothing clearly of a point in question, they will contest that point by those grounds, is not this a goodly excuse?

In his 11 Chapter he saith, we judg them, and despise them: as to the first I have often wondered, and do now, that men pretending to learning, and reason, should therein charge us with want of charity, for if our Judgment be false, it is error, not malice, and whether true, or false, we press it upon them, out of love and kindness, to keep them from the harm, that *according to our beleeve may come unto them*: but since they deny they are scismatics, and offer to prove it, we must not say it: yet I think we ought until we have cause to beleeve them, since our highest tribunal the Churches voice, from which we have no appeal, hath passed Judgment against them.

In the last Chapter he complaineth of the Catholicks for reproaching them with the loss of their Church, and arguing with their Disciples in this sort, communion in some Church, even externally, is necessary, but you cannot now communicate with your late Church for that hath no subsistence, therefore you ought to return to the Church from whence you went out, truly in this case I think they ought to pardon the Catholick,  
who

who hath, or undoubtedly is perswaded he hath a promise for eternity to his Church, and experience in the execution of that promise for 16 Ages, in which none other can compare with him, and sees another Church judged by one of the learnedst, & most prudent persons confessedly that ever was amongst them, to be a building likely to last but 80 years, to be now torn up by the roots, and this done by the same means by which it was setled, I say if this Catholick beleve his eyes, he is at least to be excused, and though I know the Doctor will reply his Church is still in being, preserved in Bishops, and Presbyters rightly ordained, yet let him remember how inconsequent this is, to what he hath said before, for ask him how doth it remain in being, if there be no such Bishops, or Presbyters amongst them, for his defence against the Church of Rome is, that the secular authority hath power to make, and change Bishops, and Presbyters; from whence it wil follow, that as they were set up by a secular authority, so are they pulled down, and un-bishoped by another secular Authority, if it be said the Parliament which pulled them down had not the 3. bodies requisite to make a Parliament, no more had that which set them up, *for the Lords Spirit was wanting both in Parliament and Convocation*, so that there was as much authority to pul them down, as to set them up, *but it will be replied that though they are pulled down, yet are they still Bishops, viz: the character remains with them.*

Alas what is their characters if their mission of Preaching, and Teaching, be extinguished, which follows their jurisdiction, which jurisdiction the Doct: makes subject to the secular authority, so that whatsoever characters their Bishops, & Presbyters pretend to have, they have according to his principles no power over

Hooker Eccl:  
poll: cha. 5.



ver the layity, and so no character can be made of any Bishop as head, and Pastor, and of the people as bodie, and flock, and consequently their Church is gone; and this he does out of a word in *Rufinus*, which he supposeth to be taken in a special propriety of Law, whereas indeed that Authors knowledg in Grammar was not such as should necessarily exact any such beleefe, especially learned men saying the contrary.

But we account our selves Bishops, and Priests not from an authority, dependant upon Princes, or inherited from *Augustus*, or new, but from *Peter*, and *Paul*, & so shal stand, and continue whatsoever Princes, or secular powers decree; when they according to their Doctrines, and Arguments are not to wonder if they be thrown down by the same Authority that set them up, & as the Synagogue was a Church to have an end, so is this with theirs difference, that the Synagogue was a true Church in reference to a better, but this a counterfeit, and tyrannical one to punish a better, as concerning the Drs. prayer for Peace, & communion, all good People wil joyn with him if he produce *Fructus dignes penitentiae*, especially if he acknowledg the infallibility of the Church, and supremacie of the Pope, the former is explicated sufficiently in divers Books, the latter is expressed in the Council of *Florence*, in these words, *viz.* We desire that the Holy Apostolical See, and the Bishop of *Rome* have the primacie over all the World, and that the Bishop of *Rome* is successor to *St. Peter*, the Prince of the Apostles, and truly Christs Vicar, and head of the whole Church, and the Father, & Teacher of all Christians, and that there was given him in *St. Peter* from Christ a full power to feed, direct, and govern the Catholick Church: so far the Council: without obeying this, the Dr: is a Scismatick; & without confing the other an Heretick, but let him joyn with us in these, all the rest will follow.

Thus Sir, you have my sence of Dr: *Hammonds* Book, in all the Particulars, which I think to the purpose, my time, nor the brevity fit for a Letter not permitting, I should be more methodical, and do rest, Your Friend, and humble Servant. B: P.  
*Bruxels the 30 March, 1654.* FINIS.